DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 566 EA 026 149

TITLE	Should We Restructure Our Schools? A Resource Book To Help Educators Explore the Idea of Restructuring.
INSTITUTION	Lehigh Univ., Bethlehem, PA. School Study Council.; Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Mar 91
NOTE	52p.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; *Decentralization; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Improvement; *School Choice; School Community Relationship; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

For two and one-half days in November 1990, members of the Lehigh University School Study Council met in retreat to explore the idea of restructuring and to reflect on its relevance for their schools. Participants included superintendents, principals, teachers, and faculty from institutions of higher education. This resource guide was developed by the meeting participants to help members of the council and other interested educators undertake activities similar to those that occurred during the retreat. The guide is organized into two parts. The first part describes the five activities around which the retreat was organized. The activities addressed the following questions: (1) What is meant by "restructuring"?; (2) What forces are pushing toward achieving a different order of results with the changing student population?; (3) What are the nature and scope of the principal restructuring proposals?; (4) What is involved in restructuring a school?; and (5) How does one create a design for a school that will achieve a different order of results? The purpose of each activity is described, as well as a suggested process to achieve that purpose. Finally, examples of materials to implement the process are listed. The second part provides two examples that illustrate how the activities and materials in part 1 were implemented. The first example describes the origins, participants, and outcomes of the three-day retreat. The second example describes how a superintendent and principal of one district adapted part 1's activities and materials to an intra-district program. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 566

EA

SHOULD WE RESTRUCTURE OUR SCHOOLS?

A Resource Book to Help Educators
Explore the Idea of Restructuring

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Developed by

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123

and

Lehigh University School Study Council
College of Education, Mountaintop Campus
111 Research Drive
Bethlehem, PA 18015-4793

March 1991

EA026149

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lehigh University School Study Council provides its members inservice programs on topics germane to educational leaders. It serves as a link between Lehigh University and Study Council member organizations, and offers publications on current events and issues in education. Lehigh University School Study Council membership consists of chief school administrations and directors of regional intermediate units and other educational organizations.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education to be the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory, serving Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and the District of Columbia. As one of ten federally-supported regional educational laboratories, RBS' mission for the past 25 years has been to collaborate with state, intermediate, and local educational agencies to improve district, school, and classroom practice. RBS is a non-profit corporation, governed by a Board of Directors made up of educational and community leaders from its region.

The RBS work involved in developing this publication was funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I: ACTIVITIES AND RESOURCE MATERIALS FOR USE IN EXPLORING THE IDEA OF "RESTRUCTURING"	5
Activity 1: What Is Meant by "Restructuring?"	7
Activity 2: What Are the Forces/Pressures That We Are Experiencing to Achieve a Different Order of Results With Our Changing Student Population?	11
Activity 3: What Are the Nature and Scope of the Principal Restructuring Proposals?	19
Proposal 1: Decentralize Authority Over Schooling to the Building Level	22
Proposal 2: Hold Schools More Accountable	24
Proposal 3: Strengthen the Links Between Schools and the Larger Community	26
Proposal 4: Alter the Content and the Process of Instruction	29
Proposal 5: Enable Parents to Choose the School That Their Children Attend	31
Comprehensive Proposals: Models of Restructured Elementary, Middle, and High Schools	33
Activity 4: Site Visit: What Is Involved in Restructuring a School?	37
Activity 5: How Does One Create a Design for a School That Will Achieve a Different Order of Results?	39
PART II: CASE EXAMPLES OF THE USE OF THE RESOURCE MATERIALS	41
Example 1: A Study Retreat on Restructuring	45
Example 2: One District's Adaptation of the Retreat Materials and Process	53

INTRODUCTION

For two and one-half days, members of the Lehigh University School Study Council met in retreat to explore the idea of restructuring and to reflect on its relevance for their schools. The participants included superintendents, principals, teachers, and faculty from institutions of higher education.

Given the importance of the topic of restructuring to today's educators and encouraged by the feedback of the participants, the planners of the retreat decided to create this resource book. Its purpose is to help members of the Council and other interested educators to undertake activities like those that occurred during the retreat. Altogether, those activities helped participants:

- develop a greater understanding of the idea of restructuring
- determine the relevance of the idea for one's schools.

This resource book is organized into two parts. The first part describes the five activities in which the retreat was organized. Those activities addressed the following questions related to the topic of restructuring.

- What is meant by "restructuring?"
- What are the forces/pressures that we are experiencing to achieve a different order of results with our changing student population?
- What are the nature and scope of the principal restructuring proposals?
- What is involved in restructuring a school?
- How does one create a design for a school that will achieve a different order of results?

The description of each activity begins with a brief discussion of the purpose of the activity. It then suggests a process that can be used to achieve the purpose. Finally, it lists examples of materials that can be used to implement the process.

The second part of the resource book provides two examples of how the activities and materials found in the first part were implemented. The first example describes the origins, participants, and outcomes of the three-day retreat for administrators and teachers from the schools and districts that were members of the Lehigh University School Study Council. The second describes how a superintendent and principal of one of the districts that participated in the retreat adapted the Part I activities and materials for a within-district program.

PART I

ACTIVITIES AND RESOURCE MATERIALS FOR USE IN EXPLORING THE IDEA OF "RESTRUCTURING"

Activity 1

What Is Meant by "Restructuring?"

Purpose

To develop an initial definition of "restructuring" that can be tested over the course of the retreat/program.

It must be emphasized that the purpose of this activity is not to develop a consensus among the participants regarding the "best" definition for restructuring. That is more appropriately addressed at the end of the retreat/program. Instead, this activity provides the participants with a working definition to guide their inquiry.

Suggested Process

1. Ask participants to read prior to the retreat/program one or two articles that discuss the concept of restructuring and provide examples of how it should and should not be used.

2. Elicits through discussion, the definition of restructuring presented in the articles.

Examples of Possible Materials

The following are the two articles that were given participants to read prior to the retreat/program.

- Corbett, H.D. (1990). Why restructure? Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

- Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 69 (5), 341-344.

Outlines of the salient points made by the articles appear on the following pages.

Working Definition of "Restructuring"
(Based on the Paper by H. Dickson Corbett, "Why Restructuring?"

1. Restructuring is the alteration of rules, roles, and relationships of an organization to achieve a different order of results.

2. An example of a different order of results would be for all students to successfully complete school with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to become productive members of the society.

   Results do not refer only to student outcomes. They can also refer to desirable changes in the organization -- for example, changes in rules, roles, and relationships. However, from the perspective of this definition, these system results should affect student outcomes.

3. Rules refer to shared understandings of the members of an organization regarding what is and what ought to be. Rules are stated in policies and procedures, curriculum guides, schedules, budgets, and so forth.

4. Roles refer to the ways of acting that are expected of all individuals occupying a particular position in the organization -- for example, the positions of teacher, student, and principal.

5. Relationships refer to the patterns of behavior expected to occur between individuals/roles within the organization -- for example, how principals and teachers relate to each other, how teachers relate to one another, how teachers and students relate to each other. Insight into the nature of current relationships can be obtained by studying the ways in which different kinds of decisions are made.

6. Rules, roles, and relationships refer to those aspects of a school's operation that should outlast the tenure of any particular individual or group.

7. One needs to undertake restructuring when the existing pattern of rules, roles, and relationships in a school is incongruent with the pursuit of a different order of results.

   Restructuring is the process of making the structure of a school (rules, roles, and relationships) congruent with the process of schooling in order to realize a different order of results.

8. Although restructuring activities are appropriate at the school building level, the overall effort must be system-wide.

An Historical Perspective on Restructuring
(Based on the article by Larry Cuban, "A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform")

1. The fundamental puzzle: "How can it be that so much school reform has taken place over the last century yet schooling appears to pretty much be the same as it has always been?"

2. A critical distinction:

   "First-order changes try to make what already exists more efficient and more effective, without disturbing the basic organizational features, without substantially altering the ways in which adults and children perform their roles."

   "Second-order changes seek to alter the fundamental ways in which organizations are put together. They reflect major dissatisfactions with present arrangements. Second-order changes introduce new goals, structures, and roles that transform familiar ways of doing things into new ways of solving persistent problems."

3. The last significant widespread restructuring of the American public education system was the shift in the latter half of the 19th century from the one-room schoolhouse with one untrained, unsupervised teacher to the graded school with multiple certified, supervised staff.

4. Most 20th century reform has succeeded in affecting "first-order" changes -- changes that seek to make schools more efficient and effective, without affecting fundamental organizational features. Examples of first-order changes include: changing certification standards, supervision and evaluation practices, instructional materials, scheduling procedures, and assessment procedures.

5. Of course, there have been efforts to make second-order changes; however, these have only affected a small number of schools -- for example, changes like student-centered instruction, non-graded schools, team teaching, open-spaced architecture.

6. Much of the impetus for second-order reform has been the result of outside forces.

7. Schools generally respond to second-order reforms -- those that seek to affect fundamental organizational features -- in two ways. First, they relegate them to the periphery, thus ensuring that they do not affect the core program of the school (e.g., special education and other alternative programs). Second, they turn second-order reforms into first-order reforms (e.g., the curriculum reform of the 1960's ended up affecting the content of textbooks, but little else).

Activity 2

What Are the Forces/Pressures That We Are Experiencing to Achieve a Different Order of Results With Our Changing Student Population?

Purpose

Corbett and Cuban both stress the notion that "restructuring" or "second-order changes" are grounded in dissatisfaction with the results being achieved by the organization and/or the desire to achieve a "different order of results."

This activity seeks to determine the extent to which participants are sensing dissatisfaction with the current results being achieved by their schools, or experiencing pressures to achieve a different set of educational outcomes.

Suggested Process

1. Ask participants prior to the activity to:

   - provide information about demographic changes and changes in expectations with regard to results, being experienced by their schools

   - rate the importance of alternative educational goals for their school community.

   (See examples of survey forms on the following pages.)

2. Present to the participants the results of the information and ratings provided. Explore the extent to which the participants' schools and districts are:

   - experiencing a changing student population -- a population that is changing along the lines suggested by Harold Hodgkinson

   - experiencing internal pressures (pressures from within the school community) to achieve a different order of results with their students

   - experiencing external forces/pressures to achieve a different order of results -- forces/pressures resulting from the results advocated national leaders/groups.

Examples of Possible Materials

1. Survey of Demographic and Other Changes Being Experienced by Participants' School Communities (see page 13)

2. Survey of the Relative Importance of Alternative Student Outcomes (see page 15)

3. Hodgkinson, H.L. (1989). The demography of the Mid-Atlantic states and the District of Columbia: The state and their educational systems. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

4. Forces/Pressures of Restructuring the Schools: A Summary (see page 12)

5. An Overview: Calls for a Different Order of Results (see page 13).

Participant Survey - Part I
Changing Characteristics of Students and Their Families

Directions: Please complete the following items for the last complete school year. Many of the items will ask you to estimate trends in student characteristics (e.g., enrollments, participation in programs). Please make these estimates on the basis of your personal knowledge and impressions; it is not necessary for you to base your estimates on actual data.

Name of Respondent/Position: _____

Name of District: _____

1. Total K-12 Enrollment: _____

2. What percentage of students are:

_____ Asian _____ Black _____ Hispanic _____ White _____ Other

3. What percentage of students are enrolled in:

_____ Chapter 1 programs _____ Bilingual programs _____ Special education

4. What percentage of students start school (either kindergarten or first grade) prepared to learn that grade's curriculum? _____

5. When students leave school, what percentage are:

_____ Employed full part time _____ Attending two or four year college _____ Attending technical school

_____ Serving in the military _____ Other _____ (please specify)

6. Over the past five years, how have the course requirements for your district's educational programs changed? Check one.

_____ Less rigorous _____ No change _____ More rigorous

7. Over the past five years, how have grading standards in your district's educational programs changed? Check one.

_____ Less rigorous _____ No change _____ More rigorous

8. Over the past five years, how has the percentage of students in the following groups changed in your district? Check one for each group.

Students:	Decreased	No Change	Increased
Belonging to racial/ethnic minorities	_____	_____	_____
Enrolled in Chapter 1 programs	_____	_____	_____
Enrolled in special education	_____	_____	_____
Retained in grade	_____	_____	_____
Leaving school before graduation	_____	_____	_____
From single parent families	_____	_____	_____
From families with divorced parents	_____	_____	_____
With parent(s) supporting educational program at home	_____	_____	_____

Participant Survey - Part II
Relative Importance of Alternative Student Outcomes

Directions: Advocates of restructuring call upon schools to achieve a different order of results with their students. Below is a list of outcomes that schools might help all of their students achieve. If you feel the list is missing some important outcome, please add it to the list. Then, complete the survey by circling the number that matches the importance that your school district places of achieving each of the listed outcomes.

Name: _____ District: _____

All students should achieve the following outcomes:	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Minimally Important
1. Basic knowledge expected of a "literate" person (cf. Hirsch)	3	2	2
2. Higher order thinking and problem solving skills	3	2	1
3. Knowledge, skills, and attitudes associated with being an active, contributing U.S. citizen	3	2	1
4. Knowledge, skills, and attitudes associated with being a productive worker (e.g., work ethic, career awareness, and vocational skills)	3	2	1
5. Knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to develop and maintain one's physical and mental well-being	3	2	1
6. Knowledge, skills, and attitudes to work cooperatively with others -- particularly those of different racial, ethnic, class, and religious backgrounds	3	2	1
7. Knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to express oneself through expressive and performance arts	3	2	1
8. Other: _____ _____ _____	3	2	1

Forces/Pressures for Restructuring the Schools: A Summary

There are forces at work in America and the world that are creating the need for the restructuring of schools and their school systems, especially in communities with concentrations of at-risk students. The following are examples of these forces.

1. The changing world economy is requiring American businesses to seek a more flexible and highly skilled work force, if they are to remain competitive.

2. Both international tests of science and mathematics proficiency and the National Assessment of Educational Progress are providing evidence that American students are not competitive with the students of other developed countries and are not acquiring the knowledge and skills needed by today's society.

3. Current demographic data show that the proportion of the American population over age 65 is growing rapidly, while the proportion of the population under age 17 is becoming smaller. These trends increase the value of each youth to the future of society.

4. Current demographic data show that the segment of the school-age population with which the schools have been least successful (e.g., minorities and low SES) is growing more rapidly than the segment with which they have been most successful (e.g., white and middle class).

5. Students who fail to acquire through schooling the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to become successful workers, citizens, and parents become a cost to society. Some see this cost as being a threat to the future of the society.

An Overview: Calls for a Different Order of Results

Not only are national, state, and local educational leadership advocating new goals for education, but they are also suggesting that today's schools and school systems are not structured to achieve such goals. The following are examples of calls by various leaders and groups for a different order of results.

1. Council of Chief State School Officers' adoption of a policy statement that calls upon the states "...to provide the educational programs and to assure other necessary and related services so that this nation enters the 21st century with virtually all students graduating from high school." The Council followed up on this statement by providing incentive grants to 11 states to undertake activities aimed at achieving the intent of the policy statement.

2. The National Association of State Boards of Education has recommended the restructuring of early schooling into integrated units serving children, ages 4 to 8. These units are to be designed to be both responsive to the developmental needs of young children and supportive of the learning of those skills and dispositions required for school success.

3. The Education Commission of the States not only has made "restructuring" one of its priorities, but has also joined forces with the Coalition of Essential Schools to sponsor collaborative state-local projects to explore what changes are needed in state policy and practice to support schools implementing the Coalition's nine principles. These principles provide a vision of schooling that seeks to develop higher order intellectual skills and dispositions in all secondary students.

4. The recent reauthorization of Chapter 1 has required schools to develop new goals for students receiving Chapter 1 services -- goals related to:

   - their achievement of both basic and advanced skills
   - their achievement of grade level proficiency
   - their success in the regular school program.

   In addition, the new law has made it easier for schools with high concentrations of eligible Chapter 1 students to initiate school-wide projects -- projects that allow school staff to have discretion over the use of Chapter 1 resources, provided demonstrable improvement in achievement of the desired outcomes is shown within three years.

5. The President and the nation's governors have negotiated six goals and related objectives, which they believe represent the results that America's educational system should be achieving. In presenting these goals and objectives, they note that "...they cannot be achieved by our educational system as it is presently constituted. Substantial, even radical changes will have to be made." They then outline by educational level what some of those changes will have to be. (See: U.S. Department of Education. (1990. July). National goals for education. Washington, DC: Author.)

Activity 3

What Are the Nature and Scope of the Principal Restructuring Proposals?

Purposes

This activity seeks to develop participants' understanding of specific proposals for "restructuring" schools, and. in the process, to develop a clearer concept about what kinds of changes should be described as "restructuring."

To achieve these purposes, participants will use the resources provided to explore the following general questions.

1. In as precise terms as possible, what are the changes in structure and practice being proposed?

2. To what extent do the proposed changes affect rules, roles, and relationships?

3. How will these changes enable schools to achieve a different order of results?

4. To what extent is there evidence that the proposed changes will achieve a different order of results?

5. How feasible is it for a school/district to make the proposed changes in structure and practice?

Overview of Principal Restructuring Proposals

The proposals for how schools should be restructured have been organized into the following six clusters:

Proposal 1: Decentralize authority over schooling to the building level. This cluster includes proposals for school-site management and for the "professionalization" of teaching.

Proposal 2: Hold the schools more accountable. This cluster frequently is coupled with proposal 1. The argument goes: If schools are provided increased authority, then they should be more accountable for what they accomplish. Embedded in this cluster are the questions: for what should schools be held accountable, and what measures should be used to assess school performance?

Proposal 3: Strengthen the links between schools and the larger community. This cluster includes proposals for elementary schools as family development centers -- centers that bring under one roof education, health, and social services. It also includes proposals that secondary schools harness family and community resources to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

create an environment that prepares American youth for assuming the adult roles of worker, citizen, and parent.

Proposal 4: Alter the content and the process of instruction. This cluster includes proposals to modify the school curriculum in substantial ways, the dominant model of instruction followed in most classrooms, and the ways in which student learning is assessed. Currently, the most radical proposals are coming from groups concerned about mathematics and science education.

Proposal 5: Enable parents to choose the school their children attend. This cluster includes proposals that range from creating special interest schools (e.g., magnet schools, alternative schools) to providing for open-enrollment of students across schools within a district or across districts.

Comprehensive Proposals: Redesign schools at each level -- elementary, middle, and high schools. This cluster includes the comprehensive proposals for how elementary schools and secondary schools should be restructured. These proposals are derived, for example, from the work of Comer, Levin, and Sizer.

Suggested Process

1. Organize participants into small discussion groups of 6 to 8 members. Assign each group a proposal to explore.

2. Select or ask each group to appoint a group facilitator and a recorder. The facilitator guides the discussion, ensuring that all the activities are completed; the recorder summarizes the discussion, so that it can be shared with other groups.

3. Use the process described in the cooperative learning literature as a "jigsaw." In effect, each member of the group is responsible for drawing critical content from a specific resource, and then sharing that content in a way that contributes to the group's task of formulating answers to the questions.

4. Allocate 90 to 120 minutes for a group of participants to explore a proposal.

   - Take about 10 minutes to orient the group to the proposal, the resource materials, and its task. During this period, the facilitator reviews the resource materials and assigns them to members of the group. (If there is a video clip as one of the resources, the group can decide to have one or two persons to view it, or to have the entire group view it at the beginning or end of the information-gathering time block.)

- Allocate 30 to 40 minutes for members of the group to gather information from the resource materials. In reviewing a resource, a group member's task is to: (1) identify content that speaks to the questions, and (2) summarize that content, so that they can share it in a succinct way with the other members of the group.

- Allocate 40 to 50 minutes for the members of the group to pool the information that they have gathered to address the first four questions. At the beginning of the sharing session, the facilitator asks each member to take 20 to 30 seconds to outline what they have to share with respect to each question in turn. After each member has presented their outline, the members share for each question the information that they found relevant. The group recorder summarizes that information on flip chart paper.

- Take about 20 minutes to consider the question of feasibility. With the answers for the first four questions before them, the group discusses the question of feasibility. During this part of the session, members are encouraged to make explicit the values, beliefs, and experiences that shape their views of the feasibility of the proposed changes.

5. If there are several groups working on different proposals, ask the recorders, at the end of the activity, to share the perspectives developed by their respective groups.

Materials

The following pages contain an overview of what each of the proposals entails, a tailored set of questions for each proposal, and examples of the types of materials available to explore each proposal. With respect to the materials, it should be noted that these are examples of materials available in 1990. When planning these jigsaws, review recent journals and other publications for perhaps more up-to-date articles and reports.

Proposal 1: Decentralize Authority Over Schooling to the Building Level

Overview

This proposal calls upon district leadership to delegate authority to building level staff -- for example, authority to make curriculum, personnel, and budget decisions. This proposal assumes that such delegation of authority will result in better decisions being made in those three areas and in increased school staff commitment to and ownership of what happens in their building. This proposal also assumes that such delegation of authority will increase a district's ability to hold school staff accountable for the results that they achieve. This proposal affects most directly the roles and relationships of the principal, the teachers and other staff who become involved in decision-making at the building level, the superintendent, and district staff who work with principals and teachers.

Suggested Questions for Proposal 1

1. In as precise terms as possible, what "authority" is to be decentralized to the building level -- that is, what decisions are to be made at the building level?

2. How does the proposed decentralization of authority affect:

   - rules (e.g., how decisions are made)
   - roles (e.g., who makes the decisions)
   - relationships (e.g., how would relationships among principals, teachers and parents change; how would relationships between school staff and central office staff change)?

3. How will the proposed decentralization of authority enable schools to achieve a different order of results?

4. To what extent is there evidence that the decentralization of authority to the building level will achieve a different order of results?

5. How feasible is it to decentralize authority to the building level?

Examples of Possible Materials

Burns, L.T. & Howes, J. (1988, August). Handing control to local schools: Site-based management sweeps the country. The School Administrator, 7(45), 8-10.

Administrators from Parkway School District in Chesterfield, Missouri outline the three components of their school-site management program: establishment of School Effectiveness Teams, team training, and flexible staffing.

Casner-Lotto, J. (1988, January). Expanding the teacher's role: Hammond's school improvement process. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 349-353.

This summary of a case study of the first three years of the implementation of a "School Improvement Process" in the schools of Hammond, Indiana reflects on the variability of implementation, the effects of the effort on the union and on contract negotiation, and the critical role played by the district's superintendent.

Clune, W.H. & White, P.A. (1988). School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for future research. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education, Rutgers University.

This summary is based on the results of a survey of school districts that have had a tradition of decentralized authority. It describes the variability in organization and operation of school-based management, the impact of different organizational patterns on the roles of administrators and teachers, and the issues that must be addressed when a district moves to decentralize certain authorities.

Hallinger, R. & Richardson, D. (1988, Winter). Models of shared leadership: Evolving structures and relationships. The Urban Review, 20(4), 229-245.

This conceptual analysis explores four forms of structured teacher involvement in schoolwide decision-making: Instructional Leadership Teams, Principal Advisory Councils, School Improvement Teams, and Lead Teacher Committees. The models are compared in terms of purpose, operation, roles of teachers and the principal, and potential impact on teacher leadership and empowerment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Proposal 2: Hold Schools More Accountable

Overview

This proposal calls for the design and implementation of accountability systems that will encourage schools to work for a different order of results. A critical component of these systems involves the development and use of new measures of student achievement, measures that in contrast to standardized achievement tests, assess students' ability to perform school-relevant tasks and that involve the application of higher order thinking and problem solving skills. Another critical component of these systems involves state monitoring of schools' success in developing students' ability to perform such complex tasks, state recognition of those schools that are highly successful, and state assistance, and if necessary, sanctions for schools that are consistently unsuccessful.

The current literature related to this proposal tends to focus either on general design issues related to such accountability systems or on the new measures that are needed.

Suggested Questions for Proposal 2

1. In as precise terms as possible, what changes would have to be made to hold schools more accountable?

2. To what extent do changes affect:

   - rules (e.g., for what might schools be held accountable, what indicators would be used to hold schools more accountable)

   - roles (e.g., who would hold schools accountable)

   - relationships (e.g., how would relationships among principals, teachers, students, and parents change; how would relationships between school staff and central office staff change)?

3. How will "holding schools more accountable" enable them to achieve a different order of results?

4. To what extent is there evidence that "holding schools more accountable will achieve a different order of results?

5. How feasible is it to "hold schools more accountable?"

Examples of Possible Materials

Design issues

U.S. Department of Education. (1988). Creating responsible and responsive accountability systems (Section 5). Washington, DC: Author, 37-43.

This section discusses six dilemmas involved in designing effective accountability systems: balancing oversight and improvement, determining the appropriate level of accountability, balancing statewide comparability with local ownership, expanding alternatives to traditional standardized tests, making fair comparisons, and ensuring adequate capacity.

U.S. Department of Education. (1988). Creating responsible and responsive accountability systems (Section 6). Washington, DC: Author, 45-50.

This section presents recommendations for improving the design and use of performance accountability systems. These include not only general suggestions regarding the design of such systems, but also suggestions on how to incorporate in such systems a strategy for improving low achieving schools and a strategy for sustaining high achieving and significantly improving schools.

Cohen, M. (1988). State-level issues. (In Restructuring the educational system: Agenda for the 1990s.) Washington, DC: Center for Policy Research, National Governors' Association, 13-18.

This section suggests changes that will be required at the state level in order for restructuring to occur at school and district levels. These changes are discussed in related to the following topics: setting educational goals, stimulating local innovation, and rethinking state accountability systems.

Alternative forms of assessment

Willis, S. (1990, September). Transforming the test. Experts press for new forms of student assessment. ASCD Curriculum Update, 3-6.

This bulletin gives an overview of alternative forms of assessment being proposed, and discusses the potential advantages and disadvantages of standardized achievement tests and the alternatives being proposed.

Wiggins, G. (1989). A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(9), 703-713.

In this article, Wiggins argues that in order for tests to be more valuable, more appropriate standards for student outcomes must be established, and more authentic tests must be developed.

The Coalition of Essential Schools. (1990, March) Performance and exhibitions: The demonstration of mastery. Horace.

This newsletter describes characteristics of "authentic performances" -- performances that can be used to assess student mastery of complex skills and essential knowledge. It also provides examples of performances being used by members of the Coalition of Essential Schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Proposal 3: Strengthen the Links Between Schools and the Larger Community

Overview

This proposal calls for stronger links between schools and parents, social service and health agencies, businesses, and other community agencies. This proposal starts with the dramatic changes that are occurring in the structure of families and in the quality of the community environment in which the majority of children are being raised. For example, increasing numbers of children are being reared in two working parent families, single parent families, blended families, families in poverty, families that are abusive, families that find themselves in communities that experience high levels of crime and in which drugs are prevalent. Given the impact that these conditions can have upon children's development and ability to focus on school-related tasks, this proposal argues that schools must be a catalyst for organizing and brokering services to help families in difficulty and for stimulating improvement in the community that surrounds them.

Suggested Questions for Proposal 3

1. In as precise terms as possible, what "links" between school and the larger community are being proposed?

2. To what extent do the proposed "links" affect:

   - rules (e.g., how do the proposed links affect schools' traditional use of community services and community settings)

   - roles (e.g., who is responsible for building and maintaining the "links")

   - relationships (e.g., how would relationships between the school staff and the staff of the various community agencies change; how would relationships between school staff and the business community change)?

3. How will the development of these links between school and the larger community enable schools to achieve a different order of results?

4. To what extent is there evidence that the proposed links between schools and the larger community will achieve a different order of results?

5. How feasible is it for a school/district to build and maintain the proposed links between it and the larger community?

Examples of Possible Materials

General

McDonnell, L.M. (1989). Strengthening links between the school and the larger community. Restructuring American schools: The promise and the pitfalls. New York: National Center on Education and Employment, Teachers College, Columbia University, 42-47.

This review describes several approaches to linking schools with community agencies and businesses, outlines problems encountered in creating such linkages, and suggests guidelines for initiatives to increase such linkages.

Elementary-focused

Comer, J.P. (1988, November). Educating poor minority children. Scientific American, 259(5), 42-48.

The author offers an historical perspective on the problems experienced by poor minority children in school, summarizes the psycho-social needs of such children, and describes a twelve-year program in New Haven, Connecticut involving school governance teams, mental health teams and parent groups in collaborative efforts to address those children's needs.

Shedlin Jr., A., Klopf, G.J. & Zaret, E.S. (1988). The school as locus of advocacy for all children. New York: Elementary School Center, 1-20.

This position paper makes the case that the current design of American elementary schools no longer meets the needs of the current society, proposes that elementary schools need to become advocates for children in the broadest sense, and presents the essential features of a new design for schooling that involves services and functions that go beyond providing a high quality curriculum and effective instruction.

Secondary-focused

National Association of State Boards of Education. Joining forces: A report from the first year. Alexandria, VA: Author. (Excerpts, case descriptions.)

This report provides a brief description of the efforts of three states (Michigan, New Jersey, and New York) to link educational and social service agencies in activities that positively affect students' school performance.

Cohen, D.L. (1989, March). Joining forces: States and communities experiment with child-service links. Education Week, 15.

This article highlights the findings of a 1988 National Association of State Boards of Education survey of state and local efforts to link education and human services agencies in efforts to help children and families at risk.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Justiz, M.J. & Kameen, M.C. (1987, January). Business offers a hand to education. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(5), 379-383.

This article describes the activities of several successful public-private partnership programs aimed at making schooling more effective for at-risk youth (Oxford School District and DEC collaborative, the Peninsula Academies, Rick's Academy, and Washington's Cities in Schools program).

Wilson, B.L. & Rossman, G.B. (1986, June). Collaborative links with the community: Lessons from exemplary secondary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10), 709-711.

This article describes the five primary ways in which middle and high schools, identified through the U.S. Department of Education's Secondary School Recognition Program, open themselves to their communities and forge collaborative efforts.

Ianni, F.A.J. (1989, May). Providing a structure for adolescent development. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(9), 673-682.

This article summarizes the findings of an in-depth, longitudinal study of the experiences of adolescents, discusses factors that support adolescent development, and suggests activities that schools and communities could undertake to strengthen the structure for adolescent development that they provide.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Proposal 4: Alter the Content and the Process of Instruction

Overview

This proposal calls for significant change in the content and method of instruction. This proposal reflects new understandings of children and their cognitive development. It is based on an increasing concern that students are not developing the higher order thinking and problem-solving skills that they will need to be successful adults in the 21st century. It is consistent with the position that all children can learn and that, therefore, all children and youth should be successful in school.

Suggested Questions for Proposal 4

1. In as precise terms as possible, what are the changes in the content and process of instruction being proposed?

2. To what extent do the proposed changes in the content and process of instruction affect:

   - rules (e.g., what will be the school's curriculum; how will the quality of instruction provided by teachers be monitored and evaluated)

   - roles (e.g., how are roles of teachers and students affected)

   - relationships (e.g., how would relationships between teachers and students be changed; how would the relationships between teachers and their supervisors be changed)?

3. How will these changes in the content and the process of instruction enable schools to achieve a different order of results?

4. To what extent is there evidence that the proposed changes in the content and process of instruction will achieve a different order of results?

5. How feasible is it for a school/district to make the proposed changes in the content and process of instruction?

Examples of Possible Materials

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1988). Appropriate Education in the Primary Grades. A position statement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Washington, DC: Author.

This position statement outlines appropriate and inappropriate practice for the following components of an educational program for young children: curriculum goals, teaching strategies, integrated curriculum, guidance of socio-emotional development, parent-teacher relations, and evaluation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Knapp, M.S. & Turnbull, B.J. (1990). Better schooling for the children of poverty: Alternatives to conventional wisdom. (Volume 1: Summary.) Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.

This report synthesizes current research-based thinking about effective academic instruction for elementary schools serving large numbers of students from poor families. It identifies flaws in current conventional wisdom regarding focusing on learners' deficits, curriculum organized as discrete skills sequenced from basic to higher order, the reliance on teacher-directed instruction, the rigid application of classroom management principles, and the long-term grouping of students by achievement or ability.

Kysilko, D. (1988). Rethinking curriculum: A call for fundamental reform. (A report of the National Association of State Boards of Education Curriculum Study Group, October, 1988.) Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.

This report of the Curriculum Study Group of the National Association of State Board of Education recommends changes in curriculum, instructional practices, instructional materials, school organization, and accountability systems that are needed, if high school graduates are to demonstrate achievement of the following outcomes: "(1) think, learn, and solve problems; (2) communicate effectively; (3) work cooperatively; and (4) understand the basic concepts of a democracy, the rights and obligations of citizenship, and the place of the United States in the world structure."

O'Neill, J. (1990, September). New curriculum agenda emerges for '90s. ASCD Curriculum Update.

This bulletin highlights the current curriculum reform efforts in mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts. It suggests that these efforts reject the "coverage" model of curriculum, and that they seek to reduce the amount of "review" build into the current curriculum, support active learning, encourage interdisciplinary courses, and eliminate curriculum organized into ability tracks.

Newmann, F. (1988, May). Higher order thinking in the high school curriculum. NASSP Bulletin, 72(508), 58-64.

This commentary offers a definition of higher order thinking from the following three perspectives: content, skills, and dispositions. It then discusses curricular, pedagogical, organizational, and cultural explanations as to why higher order thinking is so hard to promote in high schools.

Proposal 5: Enable Parents to Choose the School That Their Children Attend

Overview

This proposal calls for parents to be given the power to choose the school that their children attend. Until recently, providing parents with choice has been viewed as a way of financing private education with public moneys, using some form of voucher system or tuition-tax credit. However, now choice is being viewed as a strategy for subjecting schools to the forces of the "market place," -- forces that result from parents being given the power to send their children to schools that reflect their personal value system, that are responsive to their children's needs, and that deliver results. Advocates believe that these forces will result in a greater range of school options, will make schools more responsive to children and their parents, and make schools more accountable. Advocates also believe that when parents do choose their children's school, they will become more involved in the school and the education that it provides their children.

Current models of choice include: alternative schools, magnet schools, open enrollment plans, and cross-district programs.

Suggested Questions for Proposal 5

1. In as precise terms as possible, what are the changes that will need to be made to enable parents to choose the school that their children attend?

2. To what extent do the proposed changes affect:

   - rules (e.g., how would the rules, ways in which schools and districts operate, change, when parents are able to choose the school that their children attend?)

   - roles (e.g., how would the roles of superintendent, principal, teacher, and parent change, when parents are able to choose the school their children attend?)

   - relationships (e.g., how would relationships among principals, teachers and parents change; how would relationships between school staff and central office staff change)?

3. How will these changes enable schools to achieve a different order of results?

4. To what extent is there evidence that the proposed changes will achieve a different order of results?

5. How feasible is it for a school/district to make the proposed changes?

Examples of Possible Materials

Sanchez, K., Smith, G., Arnove, R. & Kuzmic, J. (1990). Educational choice. Bloomington, IN: Consortium on Educational Policy Studies, Indiana University.

This bulletin provides an overview of alternative choice programs being tried by school districts and states. These include both intra-district and across-district programs. The bulletin also identifies some of the factors contributing to the effectiveness of a choice program. Finally, it discusses three tensions surrounding choice: autonomy versus accountability, equity versus excellence, and diversity versus unity.

Chubb, J.E. & Moe, T.M. (1990). An institutional perspective on schools. (In Politics, markets, and America's schools. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 26-67.

This chapter presents the argument that the institutional setting of schools has profound influence on their effectiveness. It describes public schools as governed by "institutions of democratic control" that tend to be "highly bureaucratic" and to lack "the requisites for effective performance." In contrast, it describes private schools as operating in a market and, as a result, tending to possess "autonomy, clarity of mission, strong leadership, teacher professionalism, and team cooperation," characteristics that appear to be the requisites for effective performance. It concludes that public schools will become as effective as private schools only if they too operate under market conditions. The remainder of the book sets forth evidence that the authors believe substantiate their argument.

Comprehensive Proposals: Models of Restructured Elementary, Middle, and High Schools

Overview

Proposals for comprehensive models of restructured schools come from James Comer, Henry Levin, Robert Slavin, and Theodore Sizer. These models include elements of many of the other proposals: site-based management, use of more authentic measures, strong family-school linkages, more focused curriculum, and more student-oriented pedagogy.

Suggested Questions for Comprehensive Proposals

Given the inclusion of elements from the other proposals in the comprehensive models, groups are encouraged to explore how those elements are put together in each model.

1. What is the different order of results that the model has been designed to achieve?

2. To what extent does the comprehensive model include proposals for:

   - decentralizing authority
   - holding the school more accountable
   - strengthening links between the school and the larger community
   - altering the content and the process of instruction
   - enabling parents to choose the school their children attend?

   To what extent does the comprehensive model include other components than these?

3. For each component of the model, what exactly are the changes in structure and practice being proposed?

   How do the proposed changes affect rules, roles, and relationships?

   To what extent are the proposed changes "congruent" with each other and the desired results?

4. How do the proposed changes create experiences for students that enable them to achieve a different order of results?

   What evidence is provided that the proposed changes will create such experiences for students?

5. How feasible is it for a school to make the proposed changes and achieve the desired results?

Examples of Possible Materials

Elementary school models

Comer, J.P. (1988, November). Educating poor minority children. Scientific American, 259(5), 42-48.

Comer discusses the psycho-social needs of poor minority children in urban settings and describes a twelve-year program in New Haven, Connecticut to develop elementary school/communities that address those needs. The model involves school governance teams, mental health teams, and parent groups -- all collaborating in support of children's development.

Levin, H.M. Accelerated schools: A new strategy for at-risk students. Bloomington, IN: Consortium on Educational Policy Studies, Indiana University.

Levin argues that elementary schools must bring all students to grade-level proficiency, or else they will be putting those children at risk. Thus for Levin, the job of elementary schools is not to remediate, but to accelerate learning. To accelerate learning, Levin advocates an organizational approach consistent with the following principles: the development of agreement among parents, teachers, and students as to a common set of goals ("unity of purpose"), the expansion of the ability of key participants to make decisions at the school level ("empowerment"), and "building on the strengths" of everyone involved.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L. & Wasik, B.A. (1990). Success for all: Effects of variations in duration and resources of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantage Students, The Johns Hopkins University.

"Success for All" is a model designed by Johns Hopkins University researchers to ensure that every student in a high poverty school acquires the basic skills by the end of the third grade. The model includes the use of carefully selected materials for teaching reading, a form of the Joplin Plan for grouping students for instruction, intensive one-on-one tutoring for students not making progress, a team to help parents provide support for their children's learning, intensive and on-going staff development, and a building- level advisory group.

Middle school models

Maeroff, G.J. (1990, March). Getting to know a good middle school: Shoreham-Wading River. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 505-511.

The author describes his visit to a middle school that successfully "motivates the nightmare group of the student population: young adolescents." "Team teaching is the norm," "cooperative learning is widely practiced," "teacher participation in decision making is extensive," "the school day is replete with opportunities for children to be active and to expend energy," "almost every student performs community service," and an student advisory system is a "core organizing principle."

Hopfenberg, W.S., Levin, H.M., Meister, G. & Rogers, J. (1990). Toward accelerated middle schools. Stanford, CA: Accelerated Schools Project, School of Education, Stanford University, 46-75.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This section presents a conception of a middle school that reflects the features of an elementary accelerated school. It compares and contrasts conventional middle school practice in curriculum, instruction, and organization with that of an accelerated middle school. It closes with a description of a visit to a hypothetical accelerated middle school.

High school models

Ratzki, A. & Fisher, A. (1989/1990, December/January). Life in a restructured school. Educational Leadership, 47(4), 46-51.

This article describes an innovative German high school, designed to "educate children from all social classes and learning abilities. The school is organized into teams of approximately six teachers who work with a group of approximately 90 students from grade 5 to grade 10. Students are organized into 5 or 6-person table-groups for one or more years; in these groups, they learn how to become increasing self-governing and how to be helpful to each other with respect to learning tasks. Parents are involved intensively in support of their children's learning, and parent representatives participate in team planning sessions.

Carroll, J.M. (1990, January). The Copernican plan: Restructuring the American high school. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(5), 358-365.

Carroll argues that the quality of instruction and the level of student performance cannot be significantly improved until there is a change in the traditional high school schedule of the 6 to 8-period day and the definition of a high school course credit. He suggests that courses need to be restructured into "macroclasses" that meet for larger blocks of time over a portion of the year (e.g., 226 minutes per day for thirty days or 110 minutes per day for 60 days), into issue or interest-oriented seminars (70 minutes per day), and into activity/sports periods (135 minutes per day). He describes how such a schedule would benefit both teachers and students.

Coalition for Essential Schools/Re:Learning (Note: The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) and Re:Learning provide a model of secondary schooling. An especially rich array of materials were provided, because participants made a site visit to Re:Learning sites (see Activity 4) and because the Pennsylvania Department of Education has been encouraging secondary schools in the state to explore the model.)

Chion-Kennedy, L. (1987, Winter). A report from the field: The coalition of essential schools. American Educator, 18-27 & 47-48.

This article illustrates how teachers are "doing things differently and changing the way they go about their business" in accord with the nine principles of Coalition of Essential Schools. The illustrations are drawn from three inner-city schools: Central Park East Secondary School, and Walbrook and Hope Essential High Schools.

Wiggins, G. (1987, Winter). Creating a thought-provoking curriculum. Lessons from whodunits and others. American Educator, 10-17.

Wiggins describes how CES schools are moving from "covering" important ideas to helping students understand ideas in ways that develop powerful intellectual habits. To this end, he suggests the ways in which the curriculum must be redesigned to focus on "essential questions" and the ways in which students and teachers must modify the roles that they play: the student becoming the "worker/performer," while the teacher becomes the "coach."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Coalition for Essential Schools. (1989, November). At the five year mark: The challenge of being "essential." Horace, 6(1).

Sizer reflects on what the Coalition of Essential Schools has accomplished in five years, the barriers and obstacles it has encountered, and the challenges that lie ahead.

The Coalition of Essential Schools. (1990, March) Performance and exhibitions: The demonstration of mastery. Horace.

This newsletter describes characteristics of "authentic performances" -- performances that can be used to assess student mastery of complex skills and essential knowledge. It also provides examples of performances being used by members of the Coalition of Essential Schools.

Education Commission of the States. Re:Learning: From schoolhouse to statehouse (information brochure). Denver, CO: Author.

This brochure describes the National Re:Learning initiative, lists the nine principles of secondary school reform, and discusses the requirements that must be met for a state and its schools to participate.

Olson, L. (1990, October 3). 'Jury still out' on re:learning's grassroots reform experiments. Education Week, X(5), 1 & 18-19.

This article describes the progress made and problems encountered by the six states and more than 60 schools currently engaged in the Re:Learning initiative.

Activity 4

Site Visit: What Is Involved in Restructuring a School?

Purpose

This activity's purpose is to help participants develop an understanding of what is involved in restructuring a school. In part, this activity seeks to develop understanding of the tasks that a school staff has had to undertake (e.g., developed shared vision of the different order of results that they want to achieve; identifying the kinds of changes that they will need to make in current practice, in order to achieve those results; developing plans for making the changes; providing necessary staff development to support the change effort; implementing the plan, and monitoring implementation activities and their effects; and making necessary revisions in the plan and implementation activities). In addition, this activity seeks to develop understanding of the process (how the staff has organized itself to do the tasks), the problems that they encountered, and their approaches to addressing those problems.

Suggested Process

1. Work with the staff of the site to be visited, in order to ensure that they understand the purposes of the visit and structure the visit accordingly.

2. Orient participants to the purpose and plan for the visit, to the nature and scope of the restructuring effort that will be observed, and to the questions that they will be trying to answer during the course of the visit (see examples of questions presented below). As part of the orientation, participants may want to role play how they will pursue their questions during the visit.

3. During the visit, interview central office and building administrators, involved and uninvolved teachers, students, and perhaps even parents or involved members of the community. If the restructuring effort is affecting teacher and student roles and the nature of instruction, also observe instruction.

4. Following the visit, conduct a debriefing during which the participants compare and contrast their perspectives on the questions that they set out to answer.

Examples of Possible Materials

Descriptive materials of what the school site(s) have been doing and accomplishing should be shared with the participants before the visit. It may also be useful for the retreat/program organizer to provide an

"advanced organizer" to the participants that will help them understand the information that the school staff will present to them during the visit.

Examples of Questions That Could Be Pursued During the Site Visit

1. How is the district/school's study and implementation of the "model" being managed and led?

2. How is the district/school developing understanding, involvement, and commitment? (Board, administrators, staff, students, parents, and community.)

3. How is the district/school communicating its activities to all relevant groups?

4. How did the district/school decide on an initial focus for planning and development activities?

5. What is the status of planning, development, or implementation with respect to the model?

6. What barriers, problems, and/or issues are being encountered?

Activity 5

How Does One Create a Design for a School That Will Achieve a Different Order of Results?

Purpose

This culminating activity seeks to demonstrate to the participants that they have within themselves designs for restructured schools -- that is, schools that are able to achieve a different order of results.

Suggested Process

Participants are organized into small work groups (5 to 8 members). Here are directions that can be used to guide these groups' work.

1. Decide what age group your school will serve.

2. Decide what "different order of results" you want your school to achieve.

   Examples are:

   - all students achieve the traditional goals of education (e.g., Success for All, Accelerated Schools, School-wide Chapter 1 projects)

   - all students acquire higher order intellectual skills (e.g., Coalition of Essential Schools and ECS' Re:Learning Project)

   - all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required by the adult roles of worker, citizen, and parent (e.g., alternative school programs for students at risk described by Wehlage)

3. Brainstorm the kinds of experiences that students will need to have, in order for those results to be achieved. From the brainstormed list, develop short descriptions of those experiences that you believe are the most critical ones for achieving the results. Make those descriptions as vivid and concrete as possible.

4. Given those experiences, develop a design for your school. The design should present in graphic or written form the shared understandings of how the school will operate (rules); the ways principals, teachers, students, parents, and important others are expected to act (roles); and how principals, teachers, students, parents, and important others are expected to relate for selected purposes (relationships). For example:

- curriculum
- roles teachers and students play in the instructional process
- the way teachers and students are grouped
- the length of school day and year, and the way in which school time is used
- the settings used for instruction (for example, use of community settings)
- the role parents and family members are asked to play in support of the school program
- the assistance schools provide or broker to help families provide a home environment supportive of their child's development
- the way in which school staff collaborate with other family support agencies, including health and social services.

5. Prepare a summary of your work so that it can be considered for inclusion in the resource book.

6. Plan a five-minute oral presentation of your design that will be given following the morning break.

PART II

CASE EXAMPLES OF THE USE OF THE RESOURCE MATERIALS

This part presents two examples of how the process and materials presented in Part I were used by educators to investigate "restructuring." The first example describes a retreat for school leaders from a variety of school districts. The purpose of the retreat was to acquaint the participants with the concept of restructuring and to develop a common language and way of thinking about restructuring.

The second example describes how a superintendent, who participated in the retreat, selectively used processes and materials to involve teachers, administrators, and school board members in a discussion of several of the proposals as to how schools and districts could be restructured.

These examples are provided to suggest to others how the processes and materials presented in Part I can be used. The following descriptions discuss the purpose of each "investigation;" the participants; the plan for the investigation, the participants' feedback on the processes and the materials used, and the outcomes observed.

Example 1: A Study Retreat on Restructuring

Purpose

A coalition of school district superintendents selected "restructuring" as the theme for their program year. A number of speakers were identified to make presentations and engage the superintendents in dialogue. However, some superintendents expressed the concern that for them to benefit from these programs, they would need to develop a common understanding of what "restructuring" means. As the superintendents pointed out, they were all using the term, but they often had very different definitions in mind. As a result of this concern, a three-day study retreat was planned. The goals of the retreat were stated as follows.

1. To develop a shared understanding among the participants of what is meant by "restructuring" and why one might undertake an effort to restructure one's schools.

2. To model a process for developing such an understanding.

3. To provide an opportunity for participants to reflect on the relevance of restructuring for their schools.

These goals reflect the intention of the retreat planners not only to develop participants' understanding of "restructuring," but also to encourage them to consider the relevance of the content of the retreat for their schools and the suitability of some of the retreat's processes and materials for their own staffs.

Participants

The participants for this retreat came from approximately 25 different school districts, vocational schools, and intermediate units. They were selected by the superintendents and executive directors of the school districts and other organizations that made up the coalition. The majority of the participants were central office administrators: superintendents and assistant superintendents. Their experience ranged from those who were just beginning their administrative careers to those who were near retirement. In addition to these administrators, there were several building principals and a teacher.

Prior to the retreat, participants were invited to share their districts' interest in and involvement with the five restructuring proposals that the planners had identified as possible content for the retreat. The information received helped the planners select materials and allocate time.

Plan

The retreat's sessions were organized around the five questions presented in Part I. They used all of the processes and materials presented in Part I, except for those associated with proposal 5 ("enable parents to choose the school their children attend"), a proposal that only a very few participants expressed an interest in on the pre-retreat survey. The allocation of time to the different sessions is summarized in the agenda found on the next two pages.

The retreat began with a brief review of the concept of restructuring, presented in the two articles provided as advanced readings. A working definition of "restructuring" was introduced for the participants to apply and assess during the principal activities of the retreat.

The participants were presented two summaries of information provided by the participants on a pre-retreat survey. The first was a summary of the demographic trends that participants' districts were experiencing; the second was a summary of participants' ratings of the relative importance of alternative student outcomes. With the summaries before them, the participants discussed the forces and pressures to achieve a different order of results that their schools were experiencing (e.g., to ensure all students have entry level job skills; to ensure that more students reach a level of achievement similar to the Japanese in science and mathematics; to ensure that all students complete schooling, including the students who are at risk; to making schooling more cost-effective; to ensure that all teachers become outcome-oriented).

The participants spent most of the two afternoons investigating proposals regarding how schools needed to be restructured. To carry out these investigations, the participants were organized into small groups, guided by a designated facilitator. During each investigation, they read resource articles, shared perceptions of the practices being advocated or described, tested the extent to which the practices met the criteria for "restructuring" suggested by the working definition, and considered the feasibility of implementing the proposal. The small groups summarized the highlights of their discussions on flip charts, which they then shared with each other at the end of the session.

During the first evening, the participants were oriented to the school "restructuring" projects that they would visit the next morning. The two schools were participants in the Pennsylvania Re:Learning Project. This project is part of a national effort to help schools implement the nine principles derived from the study of high schools conducted by Theodore Sizer and his colleagues during the early 1980s.

The participants were organized into two groups, one for each site. During the visits, the participants talked with teachers and at one site, administrators, involved in the project. They also observed classes and interviewed students who were taking redesigned courses. Throughout the

AGENDA FOR THE RETREAT

Wednesday, November 7, 1990

9:30 to 10:00 a.m.	Registration
10:00 to 12 noon	ORIENTATION
	Introductions; Overview of the Retreat
	Review: A Working Definition of "Restructuring"
	SESSION I: WHAT ARE THE FORCES/PRESSURES TO ACHIEVE A DIFFERENT ORDER OF RESULTS WITH A CHANGING STUDENT POPULATION?
12 noon to 1:00 p.m.	LUNCH
1:00 to 4:30 p.m.	SESSION II: WHAT IS THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE PRINCIPAL RESTRUCTURING PROPOSALS
	Overview of the Proposals for Restructuring Schools
	Small Group Activity: Explore a Set of Proposals for Restructuring Schools
	-- Decentralize authority over schooling to the building level
	-- Hold the schools more accountable
	-- Strengthen the links between schools and the larger community
	-- Alter the content and the process of instruction
	BREAK
	Small Group Activity: Explore Another Set of Proposals for Restructuring Schools
6:00 to 7:30 p.m.	DINNER
7:30 to 9:00 p.m.	SESSION III: WHAT IS INVOLVED IN RESTRUCTURING A SCHOOL?
	Introduction to Pennsylvania's Re:Learning Project
	Preparation for Site Visit

Thursday, November 8, 1990

7:00 to 8:00 a.m.	BREAKFAST
8:00 to 12:30 p.m.	SITE VISIT TO EITHER EASTERN LANCASTER HIGH SCHOOL OR LOWER DAUPHIN HIGH SCHOOL (includes travel time)
12:30 to 1:30 p.m.	LUNCH
1:30 to 3:30 p.m.	SESSION IV: WHAT LESSONS ABOUT THE PROCESS OF RESTRUCTURING CAN WE DRAW FROM THE SITE VISITS? AND "WHAT IS THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE PRINCIPAL RESTRUCTURING PROPOSALS?" CONTINUED (if the site visits take more time than anticipated, Session IV may need to be rescheduled for 2 to 4 p.m.)
	Overview of Session IV Activities
	Small Group Activity: Share lessons about the process of restructuring that might be drawn from information collected during the site visits
	Small Group Activity: Explore Another Set of Proposals Regarding How Schools Should be Restructured
	-- Enable parents to choose the school their children attend
	-- Restructure each levels of schooling: elementary, middle, and high schools
6:00 to 7:30 p.m.	DINNER

Friday, November 9, 1990

7:30 to 8:30 a.m.	BREAKFAST
8:30 to 12 noon	SESSION V: CREATE OR ANALYZE A DESIGN FOR A SCHOOL TO ACHIEVE A DIFFERENT ORDER OF RESULTS
	Small Group Activity: Create or Analyze a Design
	Large Group Activity: Share Designs and Analyses
	Individual Feedback on Retreat Activities and on Materials Used
	Small or Large Group Discussion: Content and Structure of the Retreat's Product
12 noon to 1:00 p.m.	LUNCH
1:00 to 2:00 p.m.	Resource Book Committee

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

visit, the participants raised questions that helped them decide to what extent these school staffs were indeed "restructuring" their schools and gain insight into what is involved in restructuring a school. Following the visits, the two groups shared their perspectives on the two school-based projects.

The culminating activity on the last morning was to create a design for a school that would achieve a different order of results. The participants were organized into three groups, one for each educational level (elementary, middle, and high school). Each group selected a result that they wanted their school to achieve with its students, brainstormed the kinds of daily experiences students would need to have to achieve that result, and identified the changes in school structures that would be required to ensure such daily experiences. At the end of the work period, each group shared its design. Interestingly, each group sought a complex, higher order result: the elementary school group designed a school that would develop "self-directed learners, the middle school group designed a school that would enable all students "to see themselves as successful learners, and the high school group designed a school that would develop students as interdisciplinary problem-solvers."

Participant Feedback and Apparent Outcomes

The last activity of the retreat was to obtain participants feedback on the retreat's activities and their overall assessment of the retreat.

Participants were asked to register their agreement with two statements describing the two possible outcomes of the small group investigations of specific restructuring proposals. Table 1 shows that most participants agreed or strongly agreed that the sessions had helped them understand those proposals and the issues involved in implementing them.

Table 1
Participants' Feedback on Their Investigation of
Alternative Restructuring Proposals
(in percent)

	Item 1: Session materials helped me understand this proposal			Item 2: Session format helped me learn about issues involved in carrying out this proposal		
Restructuring Proposals	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total
Comprehensive proposals	62	38	100	62	38	100
Alter curriculum/instruction	67	33	100	58	33	91
Decentralize authority	22	66	89	42	42	84
Link school and communities	45	36	81	40	60	100
Hold schools accountable	37	37	74	25	37	62

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Participants were asked to register their agreement with statements about the extent to which the site visit and the post-visit discussion helped them learn about issues involved in implementing a school restructuring effort. Nearly all participants agreed that the site visit was helpful (91 percent) and strongly agreed that the post-visit discussion was helpful (91 percent).

The participants also expressed their agreement with a statement about the possible outcome of the design-a-school activity. Nearly all participants agreed (91 percent) that that activity helped them acquire insight into what is involved in restructuring a school.

The participants' feedback on the retreat overall is summarized in Table 2. All participants either strongly agreed or agreed with each statement, with only one exception.

Table 2

Summary of Participants' Feedback on the Retreat Overall

(in percent)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The purpose and objectives of the program were clearly presented.	39	61	0	0
2. The program was well-organized.	79	14	7	0
3. The program content was informative and up-to-date.	86	14	0	0
4. There was a sufficient mix of activities and materials.	57	43	0	0
5. The program used the available time effectively.	43	57	0	0
6. The facilities met the program and audience needs.	71	29	0	0
7. The program modeled a process that I could see using with a district/school staff interested in exploring the topic of restructuring.	50	50	0	0

Participants were asked to elaborate their ratings with written comments. Examples of the kinds of comments received are listed below.

- The balance between discussion groups, the site visit, and the summary session.
- Arrangement--working in groups; "the method" of "building knowledge" about restructuring. At first seemed to be "go out there and cause something to happen" but developed a real focus and final purpose and problem solving--discovery, testing some ideas, if only in "theory."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Obviously the sharing of ideas among a group who are attuned to a similar concern.
- The seminar created a situation that caused me to rethink the way our schools are organized and the way instruction is delivered. It also made me aware of a process which should prove useful in planning change.
- I appreciated it and will use the constructs to help evaluate all the messy restructuring stuff I read. A useful set of questions to pose to me.
- The background articles provided and the small group concept helped me gain confidence in the areas dealt with.
- The interaction and discussions. The opportunity to learn from others.

When asked "what would they change," two participants suggested that the amount of reading materials provided needed to be reduced (the retreat notebook contained all the articles cited in Part I), one suggested that the reading materials needed to be provided before the retreat, and one suggested that the process for working with the materials in the small groups could be made more efficient. Another participant suggested that the first day's schedule was too heavy, while the second day's was somewhat light.

Following the retreat, participants were observed in other meetings of the coalition referring to the content of the retreat. In addition, one participating superintendent chose to use selected retreat materials in their district. His use of the retreat processes and materials is described in the next example.

Example 2: One District's Adaptation of the Retreat Materials and Process

Context

The Pennsylvania Department of Education requires districts to develop a long range plan for school improvement every five years. One of the superintendents who had participated in the retreat decided to adapt and use the retreat materials and formats as a preparatory activity for developing his district's long range plan. His decision to undertake this work was also prompted by his awareness of the growing concern at the national and state levels regarding the quality of education, and the concomitant calls for schools to engage in some form of restructuring.

Three activities were undertaken by the superintendent and his staff during the first few months of 1991: a one-day planning seminar for district staff, a retreat for board members, and a day-long meeting of the high school staff. Each activity was designed to familiarize staff with a common definition of restructuring and solicit their input on the issues facing the district, particularly related to curriculum/instruction and school accountability. These two issues were chosen, according to the superintendent, because the district's ongoing self-assessment activities indicated a need to focus on the curriculum and related delivery systems.

Additional planning activities involving all levels of school staff are anticipated. The planning effort will culminate in the development of a long range plan by September 1992.

This case example describes the purposes, participants, plan, and outcomes of the one-day planning seminar for district staff. The two other activities paralleled the one-day planning seminar and so will not be discussed separately below.

Purposes

The purposes of the planning seminar were to:

- introduce staff to the topic of restructuring
- engage them in reading and discussing the retreat materials related to curriculum/instruction and school accountability, using the suggested stimulus questions, articles, and discussion process
- elicit staffs' perceptions of what was working right in the district, what was working less well, and what changes might be needed, particularly related to the two issues.

Participants

With the help of the building principals, the superintendent selected a cross-section of 30 school staff members, including staff from kindergarten

teachers to subject area chairpersons at the high school. Participants were asked to prepare for the full-day seminar by reading two articles: "A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform" by Larry Cuban, and "Rethinking Curriculum: A Call for Fundamental Reform," a report of the National Association of State Boards of Education Curriculum Study Group (NASBE-CSG).

Plan

The agenda and accompanying resource materials for the seminar are presented below.

PLANNING SEMINAR

AGENDA

8:00 - 8:45 a.m.	Breakfast
8:45 - 10:15 a.m.	Restructuring (Superintendent)
	How Technology is Affecting Vocational Education (Vo-Tech Director)
	One Approach to Restructuring (High School Principal)
10:15 - 10:30 a.m.	Break
10:30 - 11:45 a.m.	Group Discussion (4 small groups; 2 for each proposal)
	Proposal I -- How can we improve quality control?
	Proposal II -- How can we alter the content and process of instruction?
11:45 - 1:00 p.m.	Lunch
1:00 - 2:15 p.m.	Discussion: Redesign School District (two groups, made up pairs of the morning discussion groups)
2:15 - 2:30 p.m.	Break
2:30 - 3:30 p.m.	Feedback and Evaluation

The first session of the seminar introduced participants to the topic of restructuring. After providing an overview of the seminar, the superintendent presented a definition of restructuring, discussed the needs for restructuring from three perspectives (e.g., research on school reform issues, calls from national and state level groups for a different order of educational results, and external forces/pressures on schools to restructure), and charged the participants. The vocational-technical school

director followed by discussing technological changes and advancements that will impact on the district's current curriculum. The first session ended with the high school principal reviewing some of the widely-accepted criticisms of the current educational process, the need for a thought-provoking curriculum, and the principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools. He noted that these principles might also be considered for adoption as the district's goals for successful student learning. (Both the superintendent's and the high school principal's presentations were based on materials from the retreat.)

The participants were then organized into four discussion groups. Groups I and II were charged with discussing the following questions:

- How can we improve quality control in the district?
- What changes would need to be made to build in more accountability?
- How might they affect existing rules, roles and relationships?
- Would these changes facilitate the achievement of a different order of student results?
- How feasible would these changes be?

Groups III and IV were asked to discuss the following questions:

- Do we need to alter the content and process of instruction?
- What changes would we propose?
- How would the proposed changes affect existing rules, roles, and relationships?
- Would those changes be feasible?
- Would they achieve the desired results?

During the course of the discussions, the superintendent and the high school principal moved from group to group to listen in on the discussions.

Care was taken to form cross-role discussion groups. Thus, each group included teaching staff from different levels as well as administrative staff. To highlight the importance of teacher's contributions to the seminar process, teachers were encouraged to assume discussion leader roles. Recorders summarized key points and recommendations on flip charts during these discussions.

Following lunch, groups I and III, and groups II and IV, were combined into two larger "study groups." They were charged with using the information generated from the morning's discussion session to redesign the school district. As a result of this brainstorming exercise, a number of key ideas

and suggestions were surfaced that were judged to merit more in-depth consideration by the district. These are listed below.

- As a staff, believe in the philosophy of success for all students.
- Recast the district's expectations for students in terms of competency-based education, higher order thinking skills, and/or mastery learning; this would have implications for grading and reporting system.
- Utilize more interdisciplinary approaches to teaching, especially at the high school level (e.g., team teaching, core concepts, and more flexible scheduling of teacher and student time).
- Incorporate more heterogeneous grouping at the high school level.
- Create new strategies to enable students to have both adequate teacher time and independent study time.
- Develop stronger and more positive ties with various parts of the community.
- Encourage all staff to be risk takers.

The participants also identified parts of the district that were functioning well, expectations of what should be achieved by students with the support of staff and parents, and obstacles that needed to be addressed if the district were to realize the redesign suggestions listed above.

Outcomes

The last session of the day was devoted to feedback and evaluation. Participants reacted positively and recommended work continue on the topic, involving staff members from all of the district schools. In addition, the participants appreciated the opportunity to discuss crucial issues with each other and felt there were many areas where they could learn from each other. At the request of the participants, the high school principal prepared a seminar report that summarized his introductory comments and the reports of the two study groups. The superintendent reported he and the other participants were quite pleased with the seminar design, process, and outcomes.